

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 1, FY 2010-2011

Applicant	Butte County Department of Water and Resource Conservation District	County	Shasta, Tehama, Butte, Glenn, Colusa, Sutter
Project Title	Northern Sacramento Valley RWMG IRWMP Proposal	Grant Request	\$1,000,000
		Total Project Cost	\$1,334,000

Project Description The NSV RWMG intends to submit a planning grant application under the Integrated Regional Water Management section of Prop 84 for the area encompassing all six counties as an emerging planning area. This planning effort will build on current and future partnerships throughout the Sacramento Valley including cities, water purveyors, non-governmental agencies and other interested parties in the development of an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) for the identified planning area. The proposed IRWMP will facilitate and support the participation of DAC's in the NSV IRWM planning effort.

Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	12
DAC Involvement	8
Schedule	8
Budget	8
Program Preferences	4
Geographic Balance	0
Total Score	40

- **Work Plan** In general, the work plan contains adequate information and sufficient documentation to support the completion of a standards compliant IRWMP. It is not clear that the governance structure provides for a collaborative, inclusive process in its decision making process. For example: Task 2.1, Board Meetings, and Task 2.2, Technical Steering Committee (TSC) Meetings, leads the reviewer to think that the Governing Board only interacts with the TSC, not the general public.
- **DAC Involvement** While the proposal is clear on how DAC identification and outreach occurs, including potential projects in DACs, it does not demonstrate how the development of the IRWM Plan will truly benefit DACs.
- **Schedule** The schedule corresponds to all of the tasks in the work plan. It does seem a bit ambitious due to the large geographical area and diverse interests. All of the milestones on the schedule are meetings, with the exception of adopting the final IRWM by the Board. It will be difficult to gauge progress of the plan without defined deliverables as milestones.
- **Budget** The budget has detailed cost information correlating to all of the tasks in the work plan. Some subtasks in Task 2 and 4 appear to be repetitive so it is not clear that the costs are reasonable. Also, \$100,000 of match funds is coming from a USBR grant awarded to RD 108 for the purposes of preparing a Northern Sacramento Valley Integrated Regional Water Management Governance, Work/Funding Plan, yet, RD 108 is not listed as a stakeholder.
- **Program Preference** Four program preferences (include regional projects/programs, climate change response, improve tribal waters and natural resourced, and integrate water management with land use planning) are adequately addressed.
- **Geographic Balance** Not Applicable